APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/687,332	10/16/2003	Charles Atchison	030388; 190250-1520	8501

38823   7590   10/12/2010
AT&T Legal Department - TKHR
Attn: Patent Docketing
One AT&T Way
Room 2A-207
Bedminster, NJ 07921

EXAMINER
FEENEY, BRETT A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3624	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/12/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS,
WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 June 2010_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.　　　2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-2 and 4-42_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-2 and 4-42_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

　　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Change in Examiner

1.   The current Examiner respectfully notes that Brett Feeney is the new Examiner for the instant application. Further correspondence should be directed to Examiner Feeney as appropriate.

Introduction

2.   This **FINAL** Office action is in response to Applicant's submission filed on June 28, 2010.

Status of the Claims

3.   Claims 1, 5 – 10, 13, 17 – 21, 23 – 27, 29, 30 – 34, 36 – 40 and 42 were amended, Claim 3 was cancelled.

4.   Claims 1, 2, and 4-42 are pending.

Response to Amendment

5.   In response to Applicant's amendments to the claims the Examiner has withdrawn the previous rejection under §103 and has entered a new rejection under §103.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 1, 4-14, and 17-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Flam US 7,266,764 (herein <u>Flam</u>) in view of Lofton US 2003/0154116 (herein <u>Lofton</u>).

Regarding claim 1, <u>Flam</u> discloses:

An issue tracking system (col. 4, lines 19-21), comprising:

a centralized server (col. 4, lines 29-31, standard computer is acting as a server) that transmits a web page comprising a graphical user interface (col. 6, lines 24-26. Further see also, FIG 8 and associated text; noting "the present discussion is standard operating system code 811, Internet code 815, for performing functions such as email and interacting with Web pages according to the HTTP protocol, Database code 813, which is part of and controls the operation of database system 825, and process control code 817, which is application code that implements the process control system. Process control code 817 uses components of the operating system 811, Internet code 815, and DB code 813 to interact with Internet 807, local peripheral devices 808, and DB system 825. With regard to the interaction with DB system 825, process control code 817 issues queries to DB system 825 and receives the results of the queries from DB system 825.") which tracks project issues of a group project (col. 4, lines 19-21) over a network (col. 4, lines 29-30, Internet is a network) to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device (fig. 8, 9-17, col. 4, lines 25-47) and enabling a project

member to chronicle issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities (col. 9, PR table 833, each PR record, which corresponds to an issue, contains an indication of the originator of the record and who the record is assigned to), wherein the statuses comprises indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project (fig. 17, 1727 corresponds to the current step, and 1729 corresponds to the next step to be taken. This is detailed in col. 33, lines 20-40) and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific issue according to group management or administrator (col. 9, PR table 833, each PR record, which corresponds to an issue, contains a required (estimated) time and a required (estimated) cost);

a database coupled to the centralized server (col. 4, lines 29-31) that provides the graphical user interface to the centralized server (col. 6, lines 24-26), the database assisting in tracking at least one project issue related to the group project (col. 5, lines 35-36, the complaint is a project issue, col. 9, PRs are project issues, col. 10, Projects are projects, col. 11, Divisions are topics), and at least one topic corresponding to the at least on project issue, to provide access through the centralized server to a plurality of users responsible for resolving said at least one project issue (*id.* Noting PRs include information fields, priority definitions, project ids (e.g. topic), category type (e.g. another topic), reason opened (another e.g. of topic), and the like. Further, see col. 5, lines 36-43, customer complaint specialist and customer complaint specialist's supervisor are plurality of users responsible for resolving the project issue), the at least one topic being

a subject, available for selection by a user using the graphical user interface, under which the at least one project issue is related, the project issue being tracked using the issue tracking system, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface (col. 6, lines 9-49, different users have different levels of access to data (e.g. status of project issues) through the user interface, col. 5, lines 35-43, customer complaint specialist investigates the complaint (e.g. check status), col. 7, lines 34-37, returns all the records, col. 9, PR Table 833, status) and the graphical user interface allows for deletion of a project step by the one or more users (col. 6, lines 9-49 of Flam pertain to system access control. Only designated users can add, modify, and/or delete tables and other records within the system using the GUI. Fig. 8 shows action tables, which contain project steps. As taught in col. 23, lines 5-67, action tables can be added, edited, or deleted);

wherein the centralized server transmits a notification to a responsible user for each occurrence of the following: a new project issue has been created, a step toward resolution has been entered for the at least one project issue, or the at least one project issue has been closed (fig. 12, 14, Assigned To Notification, Start Date, Closed On, col. 5, lines 43-45).

wherein the at least one topic comprises a first subject involving a maintenance and repair interface to process trouble reports from customers (the Examiner respectfully notes that the specific data is non-functional and does not further limit the claim. Appropriate correction is required if Applicant would like the limitations afforded

patentable weight. However, in an effort to advance prosecution see column 9; noting the PRs include "reason_opened" and "customer" definitions.); a second subject involving a change request page listing issues that are being observed in processing of trouble reports from the customers (*id*. Noting information contained in the relational table may be used to sort and/or group specified data types. Further, see also column 10, line 51 *et seq.* Noting issues may be grouped by project type, work item type, resource category, etc. Further see *inter alia* tables 829, 835, 839, etc. noting that issue listing may be grouped according to the specified data that it represents. Even further, see AQ_trends table 879; noting PR trends may be grouped into selected lists. For example if a particular activity is persistent with a number of customers, project members may be made aware of an out of control process and the specific problems that are persisting.);

Flam does not recite to provide a storage option for a user to upload data formats.

In analogous art Lofton teaches to provide a storage option for a user to upload data formats which the user determines would be inefficient to manually enter using a format associated with the graphical user interface (par. 112, lines 1-15, link data are attachments, which are uploaded and in a different data format than the format associated with the graphical user interface).

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lofton does not teach away from or contradict Flam, but

rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching that Flam's invention already contains a storage option, the database.

Flam/Lofton does not explicitly recite however in analogous art, Gauger teaches:

and a third subject involving an issues page listing internal issues related to handling of the processing of trouble reports (see FIG 15 and associated text ¶¶0173-0174; noting Issues Portal includes an "Issues List" wherein the list includes tasks, issue resolutions and details.).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the issue tracking system of Flam/Lofton with the issue page listing issue resolutions of Gauger because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claim 4, Flam discloses wherein the centralized server is further operable to notify a responsible user via electronic mail (col. 5, lines 43-45).

Regarding claim 5, Flam discloses wherein the database has a table devoted to keeping track of the at least one topic corresponding to the at least one project issue being tracked (col. 9, PRs are project issues, col. 10, Projects are projects, col. 11, Divisions are topics).

Regarding claim 6, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein the database has a table devoted to keeping track of the at least one project issue associated with the at least one topic (col. 5, lines 18-25, col. 9, PR Table 833 is a table devoted to keeping track of an issue (record is an issue) associated with a topic (note the project_id is also an exemplary topic)).

Regarding claim 7, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein each of the at least one project issue comprises a description of the respective issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, all attributes are the description, particularly the name data field), a status associated with the respective issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, lines 50-52), and a sponsor associated with the respective issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, lines 56-58).

Regarding claim 8, <u>Flam</u> teaches wherein each of the at least one project issue comprises a priority rating associated with the respective issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, col. 10, lines 13-15).

Regarding claim 9, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein the database has a table devoted to keeping track of at least one step associated with the at least one project issue (col. 5, lines 18-25, col. 12, PR_activity Table 839, activities are steps).

Regarding claim 10, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein each of the at least one step associated with the at least one project issue comprises a description of a step related to the resolution of the respective issue (col. 12, PR_activity Table 839, col. 12, lines 49-50).

Regarding claim 11, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein the database also maintains a list of persons responsible for a respective topic (col. 9, lines 56-60, col. 35, Project_member Table).

Regarding claim 12, <u>Flam</u> teaches a network operable to transmit information stored in the database to a plurality of users (col. 4, lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 13, <u>Flam</u> teaches a personal computer coupled to the network and having a web browser operable to view the information received from the database via the network (col. 4, lines 29-31).

Regarding claim 14, <u>Flam</u> teaches wherein the database is further operable to store project issues that have been closed by a responsible user using the graphical user interface, and transmit information about a closed project issue upon receiving a request for the information (col. 9, PR Table 833, lines 52-53, 63-64, col. 7, lines 34-37).

Regarding claim 17, <u>Flam</u> discloses:

A method of tracking project issues (col. 4, lines 19-21), comprising the steps of:

storing a group project in a standardized format on a centralized database (col. 4, lines 25-29, col. 10, Project Table 831);

transmitting a graphical user interface which tracks project issues over a network (col. 4, lines 19-21, 29-31, col. 6, lines 24-26) to a client device, the graphical user interface being displayable on the client device without installation of the graphical user interface on the client device (fig. 8, 9-17, col. 4, lines 25-47), the graphical user interface chronicling the project issues that need to be undertaken within the group project including their statuses, classifications, and individual responsibilities (col. 9, PR

table 833, each PR record, which corresponds to an issue, contains an indication of the originator of the record and who the record is assigned to), wherein the statuses comprise indications of a next step that needs to be taken by one or more group members or users on the group project (fig. 17, 1727 corresponds to the current step, and 1729 corresponds to the next step to be taken. This is detailed in col. 33, lines 20-40) and the classifications comprise costs or values of a specific project issue according to group management or administrator (col. 9, PR table 833, each PR record, which corresponds to an issue, contains a required (estimated) time and a required (estimated) cost);

selecting a topic from a plurality of topics corresponding to a project issue being added, wherein the topic is a subject, available for selection by a user using the graphical user interface, under which the project issue is related (see col. 6, lines 9-49, different users have different levels of access to data (e.g. status of project issues) through the user interface, col. 5, lines 35-43, customer complaint specialist investigates the complaint (e.g. check status), col. 7, lines 34-37, returns all the records, col. 9, PR Table 833, status), and column 9; noting the PRs include "reason_opened" and "customer" definitions.);

adding the project issue associated with the group project to the centralized database (col. 7, lines 24-26, records are issues, col. 9, PR Table 833) using the graphical user interface, wherein one or more users familiar with the group project update and view a current status of the project issue using the graphical user interface (col. 6, lines 9-49, different users have different levels of access to data (e.g. status of

project issues) through the user interface, col. 5, lines 35-43, customer complaint specialist investigates the complaint (e.g. check status), col. 7, lines 34-37, returns all the records, col. 9, PR Table 833, status);

directing addition of at least one step taken to resolve the project issue to the centralized database (col. 5, lines 18-25, col. 12, PR_activity Table 839, activities are steps); and

transmitting a notification to a responsible user associated with the group project for each occurrence of the following: a new project issue has been created for the group project, a step toward resolution has been entered for the project issue, or the project issue has been closed (fig. 12, 14, Assigned To Notification, Start Date, Closed On, col. 5, lines 43-45).

wherein the at least one topic comprises a first subject involving a maintenance and repair interface to process trouble reports from customers (the Examiner respectfully notes that the specific data is non-functional and does not further limit the claim. Appropriate correction is required if Applicant would like the limitations afforded patentable weight. However, in an effort to advance prosecution see column 9; noting the PRs include "reason_opened" and "customer" definitions.); a second subject involving a change request page listing issues that are being observed in processing of trouble reports from the customers (*id.* Noting information contained in the relational table may be used to sort and/or group specified data types. Further, see also column 10, line 51 *et seq.* Noting issues may be grouped by project type, work item type, resource category, etc. Further see *inter alia* tables 829, 835, 839, etc. noting that issue

listing may be grouped according to the specified data that it represents. Even further, see AQ_trends table 879; noting PR trends may be grouped into selected lists. For example if a particular activity is persistent with a number of customers, project members may be made aware of an out of control process and the specific problems that are persisting.);

Flam does not teach to providing an option to a user to upload a data file using the graphical user interface.

Lofton teaches providing an option to a user to upload a data file using the graphical user interface (par. 112, lines 1-15, link data are attachments, which are uploaded and in a different data format than the format associated with the graphical user interface).

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lofton does not teach away from or contradict Flam, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching that Flam's invention already contains a storage option, the database.

Flam/Lofton does not explicitly recite however in analogous art, Gauger teaches:

and a third subject involving an issues page listing internal issues related to handling of the processing of trouble reports (see FIG 15 and associated text ¶¶0173-

0174; noting Issues Portal includes an "Issues List" wherein the list includes tasks, issue resolutions and details.).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention to combine the issue tracking system of <u>Flam/Lofton</u> with the issue page listing issue resolutions of <u>Gauger</u> because the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Regarding claim 18, <u>Flam</u> discloses closing the project issue upon resolution (col. 9, lines 53-54).

Regarding claim 19, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein the project issue is closed by a system administrator associated with the database using the graphical user interface (col. 6, lines 16-23).

Regarding claim 20, <u>Flam</u> discloses adding a project issue description to the centralized database using the graphical user interface (col. 9, PR Table 833, all attributes are the description, particularly the name data field).

Regarding claim 21, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein the project issue description includes a status (col. 9, PR Table 833, lines 50-52), a priority rating (col. 9, PR Table 833, col. 10, lines 13-15), and a sponsor (col. 9, PR Table 833, lines 56-58).

Regarding claim 22, <u>Flam</u> discloses adding a step description to the centralized database using the graphical user interface (col. 5, lines 18-25, col. 12, PR_activity Table 839, activities are steps, col. 12, PR_activity Table 839, col. 12, lines 49-50).

Regarding claim 23, <u>Flam</u> discloses:

receiving a request from a user for the project issue and the at least one step; and

providing the project issue and the at least one step to the user (col. 7, lines 34-37, PR_activity Table 839 works the same way, by querying the pr_id).

Regarding claim 24, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein the project issue and the at least one step are provided using hypertext transfer protocol via the network (col. 4, lines 34-40).

Regarding claim 25, <u>Flam</u> discloses:

receiving a request from the user for all project issues associated with the group project; and

providing all of the project issues associated with the group project to the user via the graphical user interface (col. 7, lines 34-37).

Regarding claim 26, <u>Flam</u> discloses wherein all of the project issues associated with the group project are provided in a user sortable format (col. 7, lines 34-37) based on an issue number associated with each project issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, lines 41-43), a status associated with each issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, lines 50-52), a priority rating associated with each project issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, col. 10, lines 13-15), a classification associated with each project issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, col. 10, lines 6-9, category type is a classification, lines 15-17, severity type is a classification), and a sponsor associated with each issue (col. 9, PR Table 833, lines 56-58).

Regarding claim 27, <u>Flam</u> discloses:

receiving a request from a user to add a step to the project issue (col. 12, PR_activity Table 839, lines 52-53, col. 6, lines 26-33);

adding the step to the centralized database (col. 5, lines 18-25, col. 12, PR_activity Table 839, activities are steps); and

linking the step to the project issue in the centralized database (col. 12, PR_activity Table 839, note the pr_id).

Regarding claim 28, Flam discloses storing a list comprising a plurality of responsible users for the group project (col. 9, lines 56-60, col. 35, Project_member Table).

Regarding claim 29, Flam discloses notifying the plurality of responsible users when the project issue has been updated or closed (col. 9, PR Table 833, date_updated, lines 52-53, 60-65, col. 7, lines 34-37, col. 5, lines 35-56 provides an example in which an email notifies a supervisor when the issue is updated).

Regarding claims 30-42, they are rejected using the same art and rationale used above for rejecting claims 17-29. This is because claims 30-42 claim a computer readable memory performing the method of claims 17-29.

8.   **Claims 2, 15, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over Flam; in view of Lofton; as applied above, further in view of **Official Notice**; (supported by Gauger).

Regarding claim 2, official notice was previously taken, was not timely traversed and is therefore admitted prior art that wherein the server is operable to communicate

using a hypertext markup language with the client device was a matter of common knowledge to one skilled in the art at the time of applicant's invention. HTML and its application to servers has been in the public domain since the early 90's. Further, see also Gauger ¶0066; noting "[t]he high level architecture of the operating system is described by an HTML interface to a database with XML data exchange for all non-ftp transactions."

It would have been obvious to combine the use of HTML with Flam's invention motivated by the fact that Flam's invention teaches using the Internet as the network and that the internet is primarily composed of HTML documents.

Regarding claim 15, Flam does not teach wherein the storage option uploads a legacy spreadsheet file.

Lofton teaches wherein the storage option is used for uploading a file (par. 112, lines 1-15).

Lofton does not explicitly teach uploading a legacy spreadsheet file.

Official Notice was previously given, not timely traversed and is therefore admitted that both uploading files and legacy spreadsheet files are old and well-known.

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as Lofton does not teach away from or contradict Flam, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, as Lofton teaches uploading files, and legacy spreadsheets are a type of file

that would be uploaded in a well-known method. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching that Flam's invention already contains a storage option, the database.

Regarding claim 16, <u>Flam</u> does not teach wherein the storage option uploads a legacy database file.

<u>Lofton</u> teaches wherein the storage option is used for uploading a file (par. 112, lines 1-15).

<u>Lofton</u> does not explicitly teach uploading a legacy database file.

Official Notice was previously taken, that was not timely traversed and therefore admitted prior art that both uploading files and legacy database files are old and well-known. Support for the Officially noted facts is provided in <u>Gauger</u> *inter alia* ¶0006; noting "notifications to individual about project issues, tasks, changes, etc., where such notifications are not necessary, and provides project documentation which can be archived for future reference." Further see ¶0021; noting "a document manager which tracks the state of documents and provides for pin pointing information that any team member may require at any point in the project." Further see also ¶¶0140-0141; noting "[t]he document manager information module is the core information exchange area of the present project management apparatus and method."

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, as <u>Lofton</u> does not teach away from or contradict <u>Flam</u>, but rather, teaches a function that was not addressed. Additionally, the combination would

have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, as Lofton teaches uploading files, and legacy database files are a type of file that would be uploaded in a well-known method. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine the teachings, motivated by the teaching that Flam's invention already contains a storage option, the database.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments have been fully considered however they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Further, the Examiner respectfully notes that the Officially noted facts taken in the Office action dated 02/07/2008 were not timely traversed and therefore are admitted prior art. The Examiner also respectfully notes that support for the Officially noted facts was provided herein in an effort to advance prosecution.

Conclusion

The references cited in the form PTO-892 were not applied under relevant sections of §102 or §103 in the above Office action, however they are considered relevant to both claimed and unclaimed features of the instant invention. Applicant is herein advised to review the cited prior art references prior to responding to the instant Office action in order to expedite prosecution of the instant application for example the following prior art is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Levy (US 2004/0002885 A1) teaches a project resource management application including assigning issues to a project manager, monitoring the status of the issue, and resolving the issue.

Vashistha et al. (US 2001/0051913 A1) teaches a system and method for managing projects, including identifying, tracking, and resolving issues.

Szabo et al. (US 7,120,589 B1) teaches a system and method for managing an issue database.

LaBlanc et al. (US 6,675,127 B2) teaches an issue management system and method which includes GUIs for creating, editing, and deleting issues, rsks, and processes for project completion.

Hurd (US 6,222,535 B1) teaches a system and method for issue tracking, including GUIs for assigning and resolving issues. Includes various issues statuses and communications with customer.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be

directed to **Brett Feeney** whose telephone number is **571.270.5484.** The Examiner can

normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30am-6:30pm. If attempts to reach the

examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **KAMBIZ ABDI**

can be reached at **571.272.6702**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For   more   information   about   the   PAIR   system,   see

http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair . Should you have questions on access to the

Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197**

(toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and**

Trademark Office Customer Service Window:

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

/BRETT FEENEY/

Examiner, Art Unit 3624

/LYNDA C JASMIN/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3624